



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,153	07/06/2000	David R. Fried	07027.0001-00	8333

22852 7590 07/01/2003

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

RETTA, YEHDGA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/613,153

Examiner

Yehdega Retta

Applicant(s)

FRIED, DAVID R.

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/02/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1. Applicant argues that "wherein a buyback ratio corresponds to a percentage of shares of issued stock repurchased from the public during a specified period and resulting in a decrease of shares outstanding" is the only limitation that the applicant asserted during the prosecution of the '854 application' to distinguish the claims of that application from the prior art. Examiner disagrees. Applicant asserted, "selecting criteria for screening the selection of stock, wherein the selection criteria consists of buyback ratio and at least one of price/sales ratio and a price/earning ratio for each stock. The above stated limitation of the patent claims is omitted in the reissue claims. Thus, the omitted limitation relates to subject matter previously surrendered, in the original application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 21-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 3622

3. Claim 21 recites generating a report ranking a set of the identified stocks with buyback based on metric associated with performance of the corresponding company. Applicant's disclosure does not teach ranking a set of the identified stocks with buyback based on metric associated with performance of the corresponding company. The specification teaches ranking stocks based on the price/sales ratio or price/earning ratio for each stock (see page 2) and, on page 4, the disclosure states, the screened stocks are ranked to provide a listing satisfying the criteria inputted by the user (step 240)...the screened stocks are ranked from lowest to highest price/sales ratio or lowest to highest price/earning ratio. Therefore the specification does not teach one ordinary skill in the art "ranking a set of identified stocks with buyback based on metric associated with performance of the corresponding company".
4. Claim 22, recites "wherein the metric is selected from group comprising a price/sale ratio and a price/earning ratio, for each stock". The specification teaches ranking the stocks based on the price/sales ratio or price/earning ratio only. Therefore the specification does not teach ranking the stock comprising of a price/sale or price/earning ratio. Therefore, the specification does not teach one ordinary skill in the art that the metric is selected from the group comprising a price/sales and a price/earning ratio, for each stock.
5. Claims 31, 41, 51, 61 and 71 are rejected as stated above in claim 21.
6. Claims 32, 42, 52, 62 and 72 are rejected as stated above in claim 22.
7. All dependent claims are rejected since they depend on rejected claim.

14.17 Rejection, 35 U.S.C. 251, Recapture

2. Claims 21-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue, which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

3. Regarding claims 21, 31 and 41, in the original presentation (in the patent), Applicant argued that the prior art did not disclose or suggest “selecting criteria for screening the selection of stock, wherein the selected criteria consists of a buyback ratio and at least one of price/sales ratio and a price/earning ratio for each stock” and “identifying the stocks from the specified selection having buyback ratios, wherein a buyback ratio corresponds to a percentage of issued stock repurchased from the public during a specified period and resulting in a decrease of shares outstanding”. The argument constitutes an admission by applicant that the limitations were necessary to overcome the prior art. The above stated limitation of the patent claims is omitted in the reissue claims. This omission provides a broadening aspect in the reissue claims, as compared to the claims of the patent. However, the omitted limitations were originally argued in

Art Unit: 3622

the original application to make the application claims allowable over a rejection made in the application. Thus, the omitted limitation relates to subject matter previously surrendered, in the original application.

4. All dependent claims are rejected since they depend on rejected claims.
5. Regarding Claims 51-80, the broadening aspect of the claims is also relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Therefore the same rejection stated above applies.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yehdega Retta whose telephone number is (703) 305-0436. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (703) 305-8469. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.



Yehdega Retta
Examiner
Art Unit 3622

YR
June 27, 2003